

The University of Southern Mississippi The Aquila Digital Community

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Archive

10-18-2002

Faculty Senate Minutes - October 18, 2002

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes

Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes - October 18, 2002" (2002). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 51.
http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/51

This 2002/03 Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Archive at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 18, 2002

Union Hall of Honors

2:00 p.m.

Members Present: **College of the Arts:** Ki. Davis, S. Nielsen **College of Business:** D. Duhon, T. Green
College of Education & Psychology: T. Hartsell, E. Lundin, J. Rachal, J. Palmer **College of Health & Human Sciences:** S. Graham-Kresge **College of Liberal Arts:** D. Cabana, P. Gentile, S. Malone, J. Meyer, A. Miller, L. Nored, J. Norton, S. Oshrin, B. Scarborough, J. Waltman **College of Marine Science:** J. Lytle **College of Nursing:** K. Masters **College of Science & Technology:** P. Butko, B. Coates, M. Cobb, R. Folse, M. Henry **University Libraries:** T. Graham **USM-Gulf Coast:** D. Alford, Ka. Davis, S. Naghshpour, J.P. Smith

Members Represented by Proxy: **College of the Arts:** T. Lewis (Ki. Davis) **College of Education & Psychology:** J. Olmi (T. Graham), E. Lundin (J. Rachal) **College of Health & Human Sciences:** J. Bethel (S. Graham-Kresge), M.F. Nettles (S. Graham-Kresge) **College of Nursing:** A. Brock (Kathy Johnson) **College of Science & Technology:** M. Hall (M. Lux), J. Mattson (D. Duhon), G. Russell (M. Henry)

Members Absent: **College of Business:** J. Crocket **College of Health & Human Sciences:** S. Hubble
College of International and Continuing Education: M. Miller **College of Liberal Arts:** M. Dearmey
College of Science & Technology: D. Becket

1.0 Call to Order 2:00 p.m.

2.0 Approval of Agenda: Move S. Nielsen; Second D. Alford; Passed

3.0 Approval of Minutes for September 13, 2002 meeting. Move D. Alford; Second S. Nielsen; Passed.

4.0 Forum Speaker: Robert Y. Lochhead: People have behaved like this evaluation system is a secret. It has been out for a year. I've distributed it through my chairs and solicited feedback, and only one person has replied. I am not the oracle in this; I need input.

In the future, connectivity and other technologies will result in dramatically increased amount of

and emphasis on knowledge. A new model for higher education that supports continuous re-learning is needed. Manual labor will be replaced by technology, and people will need knowledge that can't be replaced by technology.

Funding to higher education has eroded over the past 30 years, and, as a result of global recession, it will continue to erode.

In Ohio, less than 2% goes to higher education; in Mississippi 9% goes to higher education. If you rank Mississippi based on per thousand dollars brought in, we rank 8th. Our legislature does well by us.

Forty-six states are facing the same funding crisis. Wise and flexible investment in human capital is needed. When capital goes down, we need investment in knowledge.

The traditional student body will continue in reduced numbers. Life-long education will dominate the scene, and it will create a need for world experts and delivery systems. Thus, we need to identify our global niches and develop them. Every faculty member must be engaged as a world or regional expert, and research will become more important as they work to establish a place within the world order.

We need enhanced rigor in each discipline with crosscutting minors. There is more external money available for this than at any other time. We have thought of ourselves as a repository of knowledge, but we need to think about being a clearinghouse of knowledge: the Walmart of knowledge. We bring in knowledge, repackage it, and distribute it.

Before we set out, we need to know where we are, then to "strengthen our vessel," and "prepare the crew." We should expect nothing but the best from the swift and the strong. How do we strengthen the weak? How do we develop individuals? We need more faculty development opportunities and need performance metrics to provide information on what individuals need to do their jobs better.

A performance metric starts with the existing system. Points are assigned for research (scholarly activity), teaching (credit hours), service (internal and external), and funding. Funding is important, but it is not the only thing that is important. Next, add quality measures.

Minimum class size and equivalents for the metric: 20 lower level students, 10 upper level students, 5 graduate students, \$25,000 in external funding, 1 peer reviewed international article, officer status for an international organization all are counted equally.

Points calculation: $\text{Points generated} = (\text{lower level credit hours})/60 + (\text{upper level credit hours})/30 + (\text{graduate credit hours})/15 + (\text{research points})/2.5 + (\text{scholarly points})/8 + (\text{service points})/20$

Using this point system, we can calculate individual, department, and college distribution. We can identify areas of concentration and look for balance across a college.

Quality measures: In teaching, we should evaluate performance in later classes or in "life." We should look at placement of graduates, recruitment, performance of students on standardized tests, and their external scholarships. For scholarly activity look at how often faculty research is cited and at the quality of their publications.

Other considerations: People who bring in institutional funding should be rewarded at a higher level than those who fund their own research. Was overhead recovered? Was salary release obtained? Evaluate service, including whether it was internal, external, or community service.

The way ahead is to be true to our mission. Nurture students to be the "best." Build infrastructure and motivate students. Drive the discovery process. Engage in meaningful service that has an impact on the

community and on professional discipline. Thrust to K-12, so our students are better prepared. Stretch to economic development (help the state, so the state can help us). Work together to bring in the resources that our mission needs and deserves.

Our duty: We are "the wise." The monastic tradition of education is a poor option. We need to interact with the world, and become less of a repository. We have a duty to be leaders, preparing the path for the next generations, embracing the love of knowledge, and developing a populace that reasons and thinks critically.

Faculty Senate is encouraged to comment on and improve the performance measurement system. Encourage constructive criticism among the rest of the faculty. Participate in developing a working model of the "new university." The reason for a points system is to improve productivity. Be open minded in preparing the way.

Questions:

B. Scarborough: I think that it's difficult to quantify productivity and efficiency.

R. Lochhead: In academia we stand up to difficult things.

B. Scarborough: I'm not reticent about stepping up to difficult things, but take teaching. I've taken 10 times as much time with graduate classes as undergraduate.

R. Lochhead: In the metric it would get 4 times as many points.

B. Scarborough: I've written a book that took 12 years. It's a good book and already won a prize before it has come out. How do I get credit during the 12 years that I was researching and writing it?

R. Lochhead: That's where we need input. The concrete is not set. How are we going to measure progress? How can we help you write that book?

B. Scarborough: Regarding citations, I get cited all over the place, but I only know about it if someone tells me. I have no way to count them.

R. Lochhead: This is easy for the sciences, because we have a citations index. I'm on a task force to quantify performance for research. I hope we can figure it out.

B. Scarborough: You said that an institutional grant should count more than a personal grant. What if the personal grant leads to a publication that wins a Pulitzer Prize and that brings credit to the university? You have a bias toward bringing grant money to the university.

R. Lochhead: I'd rather be Pulitzer or Nobel than be a Pulitzer or Nobel Prize winner. Nobody can remember who won two years later. But who gave the prize, everyone remembers that.

J. Palmer: In the Strategic Plan there was a very good discussion of evaluating performance. Have you examined that?

R. Lochhead: Yes. I also read Boyers books. This system is not all embracing; it is a more direct

approach. That's why we need input. Things like shared governance should be included.

J. Palmer: The Strategic Plan concept would be more appealing to someone like B. Scarborough. Different people can bring different strengths.

S. Naghashpour: First, the problem is that you're trying to answer a hard question with an easy answer. Second, the concept of running the university as a business is flawed.

R. Lochhead: What is the biggest factor in determining the income of someone in this university? It's the amount of money that you negotiated on the way in.

S. Naghashpour: You can't compare across disciplines.

R. Lochhead: You assign grades to different people.

S. Naghashpour: They're all taking the same subject.

B. Smith: Sometimes my metrics don't capture it in grading, and so I build in a portfolio to suggest whether I have the wrong answer. This could be 10% wiggle room assigning the grade. We are professionals and have to use professional judgment on things that can't be quantified. You might integrate this, but who has the professional judgment required?

R. Lochhead: I agree. The question is how to promote the professional advancement of these people, and that's where professional judgment comes in.

B. Smith: The metric might get you within 10%, but the portfolio might get you the rest of the way.

R. Lochhead: We need to sit down and ask, "what are your major expectations for next year?"

D. Duhon: I'm assuming that you have some kind of metric that determines what constitutes scholarly or service points? How do you know what constitutes good service?

R. Lochhead: If you're a president of an international association it's 20 points, if you publish a peer reviewed article that's 6 points.

D. Duhon: And people know this ahead of time, so they know what to do?

R. Lochhead: Yes.

J. Rachal: I applaud your commitment to lifelong education. I was bothered by your suggestion that there is an easy side (quantitative) and a difficult side (qualitative). It occurs to me that it's all qualitative, and you're trying to impose quantitative values on qualitative judgments. I have one significant area of concern and that is that one gets points based on enrollment.

R. Lochhead: That's where the qualitative comes in. It's important to look at the economic value, but if you do, you get 200 in a class. We need to decide how to compare and to measure quality.

B. Scarborough: But who's most qualified to make that qualitative judgment?

R. Lochhead: Everyone has a voice. We're all qualified.

M. Henry: I thank you for coming. I was the one person from the college who provided input on the metric. There are differences between this metric and the college's past practices. The past system was used to measure overall departmental productivity not individual productivity. People could contribute very different things that contribute to the overall productivity of the unit. A difference between the metric and the Strategic Plan is that the latter offers the concept that people can contribute in different ways to a unit. Evaluation is based on assigned responsibilities. D. Cabana has asked the deans to provide the metrics that they're thinking about using for the Academic and Governance Committee to examine, so FS has taken a step forward, already.

R. Lochhead: In a normal time of growth this wouldn't be a big deal, but we're in a shrinking mode. I had to ask people to teach four classes last year. We need to tackle that through getting funding. If we just hunker down and teach four classes, then we wither.

J.P. Smith: I want to reflect on the Walmart comparison. I take that as that we're trying to find ways to do teaching and learning better. I liked the idea of looking beyond the student evaluation. In Academic Council, we've discussed grade inflation and the impact of student evaluations on grade inflation. The use of grades as motivational tools is being eroded. We need to make students work hard. The biggest boost that we could have is that our graduates are getting into the best graduate and law schools, passing their license exams. These student evaluations of teaching don't measure the quality of actual output of the course very well. We need to think about the long-term consequences of what happens to people who go to school.

R. Lochhead: You can be nice, and make them pass the license exam.

J.P. Smith: We need to be sure that we know what we're measuring, that you measure things of long-term consequence.

D. Alford: We get defensive when we talk about evaluation, because we have the sense that we can never do enough. I get assignments to do more and more things, and there is no end in sight. I need to know when I've done enough, but I'm never told that I've done enough. I see advantages in being able to compare what I've done to a standard.

R. Lochhead: These are mutual expectations. I see my colleagues working many hours, and the perception that we work half days is a gross misrepresentation. We have tasks, but we also need time to grow.

Again, I need your input. The perception is that the evaluation system is sinister, and it's not.

Ki. Davis: Is this plan something broader than your college?

R. Lochhead: Only my college. Nursing also is doing something similar. Other colleges eventually will need to.

D. Cabana: Dr. Lochhead, we appreciate your coming to talk with us. [applause]

5.0 Officers' Reports

5.1 President's Report: D. Cabana: At IHL, two researchers from MSU and UM presented a survey they have done on perceptions of higher education in Mississippi. The results are encouraging. The

survey states that 79% of respondents are satisfied with quality of the jobs being done in higher education; 86% believe that funds for higher education are a good investment in the state's future; 29% rated the overall performance as excellent and another 52% as very good; and 62% favor increasing the availability of higher education programs (through distance education). Also, 93.5% believe that universities are essential for the state's economic development. A majority said that tuition and fees are too high; 65% favor spending more on government services (including higher education). In terms of priority, respondents ranked higher education third behind K-12 education and health and human services. The survey reports that 74% favor an increase in the tobacco tax; 82% favor an increase in the alcohol tax; and 85% favor an increase in taxes on casinos to benefit higher education. An overwhelming majority opposes an increase in the sales or income tax. My impression was that the legislature might take a lead from this. It appears that the public may be ahead of the legislature in terms of its thinking on higher education as a priority.

Revenue projections don't look good. It's still very early. The most frequently heard number is 10% cuts, but nobody knows. The legislature will be revising revenue estimates between now and when they go into session in January, but we will have to wait until April to know what the real impact is. There will be no bridge money as there was last year. If it's close to 10%, then there will be a serious impact. Tax revenues for the month of September came in at \$10M less than anticipated. If that trend continues then by January we'll be hearing some dire stories about what's in store.

At cabinet, Provost Grimes reiterated that an evaluation process will be in place in the spring in conjunction with evaluation methods in place previously. The Academic and Governance Committee is working on this for FS, and hopefully it will report to the Senate in November and we'll have report for the provost by the holiday. Evaluation will be a fact of life. It's not whether, but what form it will take. There's nothing on the table that I'm aware of concerning a single process for the whole university. Nursing is working on a system. We sent letter to the deans two weeks ago asking for information on their respective evaluation processes or what they're considering. We have had no responses, except from Dr. Lochhead through his presentation to FS. The provost will communicate to the deans our desire to work with them on evaluation.

At IHL, yesterday, the board approved property purchase requests. The Albertson's building will at some point become the College of Nursing. The attraction is that it doubles the space of the college. The Foundation has committed to contributing funds for renovation.

B. Scarborough: It's interesting to me that the university has money to buy the property on Pearl Street and the building for Nursing, but not to give raises.

D. Cabana: I asked the provost about these funds. They're one-time funds. I'll endeavor find out more about where they came from and what kind of funds they are.

D. Duhon: Are we still getting the 2% raise?

D. Cabana: Yes, that will take place in January. It's tantamount to a 1% raise for this year, since it will be given mid-year.

D. Alford: Will it be across the board?

D. Cabana: As far as I know, yes.

5.2 President-Elect's Report: M.Henry: The new standing budget committee had its first meeting today. Property purchases did come up, because they create a public perception that we aren't so poor, after all. Bridge money is one-time money, too. I think this Budget Committee can ask the right questions and

can be well informed, informed enough to understand the answers or understand if there aren't answers. Bob Smith is no longer on FS, but he's on the committee because of the talents he brings. I'll meet with him next week. The Committee will try to do meaningful things on a macro sense, not be in everyone's budget. We'll identify the major categories of revenue and of expenditure, trends over a 3-4 year period. We're looking at trend data and will report back.

D. Cabana: This Budget Committee is terribly important, and can come to play an important role. If you're on this committee, please try to get to as many meetings as possible. Right now we're in a learning curve. That's good, because when we get back from the holidays in January the university budget process will begin in earnest. So the time between then and now is a good time to get our feet wet.

5.3 Secretary's Report: T. Graham: See proxies, above.

6.0 Committee Reports

6.1 Budget: M. Henry: See President-Elect's Report, above.

6.2 UFSA: A. Kaul: No report.

6.3 Transportation: B. Scarborough: We're down in ticket writers. Two were fired for incompetence. They're down to three fulltime, but are advertising to fill the vacant positions. The committee and the president have approved the gated lot. It will be the lot west of Hearst. We don't know what the fee will be. If faculty members don't use it, then we'll open it up for others. We need to fill it.

T. Green: When you say, "fill it," do you mean the number sold?

B. Scarborough: They'll oversell slightly--something like 10% over the number of spaces--on the assumption that not everyone will be there at the same time, which I think is a reasonable assumption.

We're also looking into the visitor pass situation. Cecil Wilson wants this as the first priority. There are a lot of abuses. SGA is looking into it and will report back.

Finally, when they get the time and the money, they're going to demolish some of the houses on Ross Blvd. and will make a gravel lot.

AAUP: Bill Scarborough: We have communicated with the deans strongly supporting FS in its effort to increase faculty participation in the budgetary process.

From Oct. 7 AAUP letter to deans (distributed to FS): "AAUP-USM joins FS in urging the deans to include their college's FS Budget Committee representative in their college's budget deliberations. AAUP-USM further urges the deans to include not only the FS Budget Committee representative, but also two additional faculty representatives, elected from their respective College Councils, in these

deliberations.”

AAUP also is investigating the metric system, and has established a committee to examine the issue. Mike Forster is the chair. We're working in conjunction with FS on that.

6.4 Awards: A. Miller: We've been asked by the Office of the Provost to develop a new Grand Marshall Award to be given annually, and the recipient would serve as Grand Marshall at every graduation. We developed a description, eligibility criteria, and documentation, which have been distributed to FS. We need to vote on whether we endorse this.

From "Grand Marshal Award" document, disseminated to FS:

Description: The "Grand Marshal Award" recognizes a senior faculty member who has excelled in teaching, research, and service. This award carries an honorarium of \$1,000.

Eligibility: Full-time faculty members who hold the rank of Full Professor and have a minimum of ten years experience at USM are eligible. Individuals who receive this award are not eligible for five years, and individuals who have received two Grand Marshal Awards are ineligible. Nominations will be accepted from any faculty member or administrator. Self-nominations will not be accepted. Winner of the Grand Marshal Award will be recognized and serve as Grand Marshal for commencement ceremonies for one calendar year (May, August and December ceremonies).

Supporting Documentation: Nominees should submit the following: a vita; one 500-word summary statement of teaching, research, and service contributions; letters of support, not more than three from faculty members or administrators and not more than three from students.

D. Alford: I haven't seen any deadlines for other awards.

A. Miller: We're waiting on FS approval of the Grand Marshall Award, so that we can set up timeline for all of the awards. There would be a month for nominations, then until the first week of February for nominees to get their information to the committee, and then the committee would decide on a winner within a couple of months after that. It should be finished by about April.

D. Duhon: What was the impetus?

D. Cabana: I met with the provost and Cynthia Moore on ways to recognize faculty in lieu of pay raises. I did not specifically suggest this, but it was one of the suggestions.

A. Miller: The Grand Marshal and the other awards have been increased to \$1K.

D. Duhon: This sounds like the HEADWAE award.

A. Miller: It does, and there is no reason that someone couldn't get both. HEADWAE is more external, in terms of recognition, and the Grand Marshal Award is more internal.

J. Rachal: When is the call for nominations?

A. Miller: Immediately. If FS approves this, then the letter will go out on Monday along with the Teaching, Service, and Librarianship awards. Nominations would be until November 25 or so, and nominees would have until February to get their information in.

D. Cabana: In the past, Grand Marshall has been for senior faculty. This award is written with this in mind.

D. Alford: Move to accept criteria; S. Nielsen, second; Vote: passed

A. Miller: Our HEADWAE nomination is due Monday. It has to be in Jackson by Friday. We're working on a list of nominees. We have a ballot, and we can discuss and add names.

D. Cabana: The provost office just got this from Jackson on Monday.

S. Graham-Kresge: This is a recurring problem. It's the same deadline every year. The administration should be able to proceed without the memo.

A. Miller: The Committee agrees. We think that this should be done at the end of the spring, and have it ready for the fall.

M. Henry: When is the award actually given?

A. Miller: February.

M. Henry: I suspect that a few days late would be acceptable.

S. Graham-Kresge: I think the issue is that in Jackson they put together a booklet with everyone's photograph in it, and they have a deadline for that.

D. Duhon: Would it be out of order to say that our winner would be next year's HEADWAE winner?

A. Miller: But this way, we can award more people. [A. Miller provided a list of candidates.]

D. Cabana: I withdraw my name from consideration.

J. Palmer: Where did these names come from?

A. Miller: From the members committee, and members of the faculties of their colleges. There's room for a write-in.

D. Cabana: [Accepted nominations from the floor.]

Vote: Winner is Mary Lux.

7.0 Old Business

7.1 Officers Meeting with the President: M. Henry: J. Olmi, T. Graham, and I were present. We used the FS press release as our agenda. We talked about the metric, budget committee, and seizing computers. The president said that the question of the "seizing" computers "for any reason" language in the Technology Security document has not been decided. The president seems comfortable with our having a

press release, and a number of the topics on the release that had the potential to be challenging pieces of conversation we all took in stride. I think it was a good meeting.

8.0 New Business

8.1 Governor's Brown Bag Luncheon: D. Cabana: FS will sponsor a brown bag lunch with Governor Ronnie Musgrove at the Commons dining hall on November 7 at 11:30. We can communicate that he needs to be the governor of the entire education system. We'll publicize this, and we want a good turn out. I initially tried to get the governor to address FS today, but he was unable to. I know that it is difficult to come in the middle of the day, but please encourage people to come to the luncheon for a town meeting type exchange. The executive committee will get information on the financial impact of the Governor's K-12 5-year plan. We'll have an opportunity to say that higher education has been supportive of K-12, but now it's time to look at the entire educational system. We want to know how much a teacher with a masters degree will make, maybe \$40K. Professors with a PhD start at that or less. This is an opportunity to make the governor aware of this.

J. Palmer: I like the idea of a press release, but ours seemed like something more. Dealing with individual items would work better than listing all the things we've done. We'd be more likely to get it out. We don't want to water down the message. The release should be a strong statement on a topic.

M. Henry: I agree. This release came from our discussion about getting FS actions out more quickly. We had three big things, and wanted to get that information out quickly, thumbnail sketches. It probably was too long. Student Printz did pick up on one of the items.

D. Cabana: We have some tweaking to do, but I've had positive responses from those who like getting this information out in print and over the airwaves.

J.P. Smith: The USM Mail release was good, but for external press, maybe you want to focus on one major thing.

D. Cabana: The Governor readily agreed to meet with us on the day that he's coming for the dedication of the International and Continuing Education building. I advised the president of this, and he thought that it was a good idea and would help us to get an idea of the governor's thinking on higher education.

Next month's forum speaker will be Tom King. He'll talk about health benefits.

J.P. Smith: We may be asked whether we prefer funds for health insurance or for salaries. We might want to decide which we prefer. You want both, but we need to help them decide which is more important.

Move to adjourn: B. Scarborough.

9.0 Adjournment 4:00